



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,503	02/27/2004	Mancesh Agrawala	M61 . 12-0607	7428
27366 7590 04/13/2007 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			EXAMINER FABER, DAVID	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/788,503

Applicant(s)

AGRAWALA ET AL.

Examiner

David Faber

Art Unit

2178

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-25, 31-40. exp

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____


Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On pages 13-14 in regards to the independent claims, Applicant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the cited references stating users having input devices that could share information between each other would be of no benefit or value to Bjurstrom et al. or Chiu et al stating that Bjurstrom et al. and Chiu et al. are concerned with browsing HTML pages. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

According to the Examiner based on the Applicant's argument that neither of cited references has no value since the references are "concerned with browsing HTML pages." However, according to the preamble and claim limitations of the independent claims, it clearly states "browsing system to browse a hypertext document" and the claim limitation use the elements "hypertext document." Examiner respectively expressly sees an HTML pages as a hypertext document thus Bjurstrom et al, and/or Chiu et al are within the same field of endeavor of the Applicant's invention since as the Applicant clearly admits, the cited references are concerned with browsing HTML (hypertext documents) and have thus have suggestion to combine. Therefore, in regards to Applicant arguing Buckley shows no suggestion or motivation to combine with Bjurstrom and Chui, the Examiner disagrees.

As stated, Bjurstrom et al and Chui et al fail to specifically disclose wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of user which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device. As the claim states, the users' input device don't interact with the shared displayed, just that the user is interacting with their portable input device, and that the shared display device is viewable by the same time by at all. Thus, Buckley discloses a shared display screen simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users (FIG1; Page 4, lines 9-11) of which users are interacting simultaneously with their own input device. (FIG 6B-6D; Page 9, line 30 - Page 10, line 5: Discloses different embodiments of users simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device being PDAs (Page 1, lines 27-30)) In addition, Buckley discloses the ability for users to change the shared display from their own device. (Page 1, lines 27-30; Page 4, lines 16-20, Page 5, lines 5-14) Furthermore, Buckley is in the same field of endeavor as the Applicant's invention since Buckley browses hypertext documents with the shared displayed which is viewable by many users.(e.g. FIG 6, 7, Pages 11, line 26-Page 12, line 8) . Therefore, there is motivation to combine Buckley with Bjurstrom and Chiu et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method and Chiu et al's method with Buckley et al's ability for users to interact with their own device and for the users to be able to view a shared display since it provides the benefit of allowing users interact with on their own device independently which has the ability to share information among a shared environment by allowing user send their information to a shared display, and allowing users to retrieve the information from the shared display. In addition, the shared display provides the opportunity for plurality of users to web browse the Internet as one by allowing each person from each of their input device to display web pages (hypertext document) onto the shared display wherein the other users have the ability to view the web pages at the same time. Therefore, there is motivation to combine Buckley with Bjurstrom and Chiu et al.


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER